



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,330	09/25/2000	Kazuko Suzuki	1232-4649	3027

7590

02/27/2004

Morgan & Finnegan LLP
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

VILLECCO, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/669,330

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

John M. Villecco

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: **S71 and S72**. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The current title "Camera control system and method, and storage medium" is very vague. A new title should be submitted that more clearly represents the invention that the applicant is claiming.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2612

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,866).**

6. Regarding *claim 1*, Morgan discloses a map display means in the form of touch screen (30), an input means which could be a users finger or a mouse pointer (44), a processor (20) which serves as the camera selection means since it selects the best camera for viewing the designated point, and a camera control means, also in the form of the processor (20) for directing the cameras based on the input to the touch screen or using the PTZ control (42). See column 2, line 63 to column 3, line 58.

7. As for *claim 2*, Morgan teaches that based upon the area selected in the map (50) an optimal camera is selected. Morgan discloses that coordinate data for the map (50) and floor plan are stored in memory (col. 5, lines 1-32). Based upon this stored information an optimal camera is selected. Additionally, Morgan discloses that a display wedge is also displayed on the map. This display wedge indicates a zoom and focus range of the camera. Therefore, the stored information also determines a camera parameter.

8. *Claim 3* is substantively equivalent to claim 2 with the added limitation of storing information for each specific region on the map. However, Morgan discloses that the display map (50) that is stored in the memory stored floor plans based on a coordinate system. As disclose in Figure 2, each of the objects are comprised of a specific region of the map. Therefore, each of the objects make up a specific region of the map.

Art Unit: 2612

9. With regard to **claim 5**, Morgan discloses that in the first mode cameras are only selected when an object on the touch screen (50) is touched. Therefore, it is inherent that when an area of the map is touched, no action takes place and no camera is selected.

10. Regarding **claim 9**, Morgan discloses the ability to select a camera to be controlled and to control the parameters of the cameras. The RCC controllers (80 and 82) are capable of storing and sending data to the processor indicating the camera parameters.

11. **Claim 10** is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 1. Please see the discussion of claim 1 above.

12. **Claim 11** is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 2. Please see the discussion of claim 2 above.

13. **Claim 12** is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 3. Please see the discussion of claim 3 above.

14. **Claim 14** is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 5. Please see the discussion of claim 5 above.

15. **Claim 18** is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 9. Please see the discussion of claim 1 above.

16. **Claim 19** is considered a control program claim corresponding to claim 1. The processor (20) of Morgan would inherently be run using computer code. Please see the discussion of claim 1 above.

17. **Claim 21** is considered a control program claim corresponding to claim 9. Please see the discussion of claim 9 above.

Art Unit: 2612

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. **Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,866).**

20. Regarding *claim 6*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Morgan discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. While Morgan does teach selecting the closest camera to a selected position on a display map (50), Morgan does not disclose how he determines which camera is the closest. However, Official Notice is taken as to the fact that it is well known in the art to determine relative distances between objects in a digital map based on coordinate maps. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to calculate the distance between the selected object on the map and the cameras so that an accurate determination can be made as to the closest camera of Morgan.

21. *Claim 15* is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 6. Please see the discussion of claim 6 above.

22. **Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,866) in view of Sengupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,647).**

23. Regarding *claim 7*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Morgan discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Morgan fails to explicitly disclose that based

Art Unit: 2612

upon the stored ranges, a determination is made as to whether or not a camera is capable of viewing the selected point. Sengupta, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to determine whether or not an object is within a viewable range of a plurality of video cameras. As disclosed in column 8, lines 36-41, Sengupta discloses a method of automatically tracking an object and determining whether or not the location of the object lies within the range of the cameras. By operating to determine whether or not a point is within the range of a plurality of cameras, the operation of the camera can be customized for operating under a plurality of different circumstances, such as when the object lies outside of a viewable range. Sengupta also discloses selecting a camera which has the best viewing angle for viewing the object. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine if an object lies within an operating range of a plurality of cameras so that the operation can be customized for situations where the object lies outside of the range.

24. *Claim 16* is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 7. Please see the discussion of claim 7 above.

25. **Claims 8, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,866) in view of Paff (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,827).**

26. Regarding claim 8, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Morgan discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Morgan fails to explicitly state that the camera selection means selects a plurality of cameras capable of selecting an image of one point and the control means controls the plurality of cameras to the point. Paff, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to control a plurality of cameras to point to a desired point. More

Art Unit: 2612

specifically, Paff discloses that the master camera (MD) sends information on the object being tracked to a plurality of slave cameras (SD) which are, in turn, focused on the object. The slave cameras have a controller (10) which determines if the object is within its range and if it is, the lens assembly (17) is focused on the object. By allowing several cameras to focus on the subject the user is given a plurality of views of varying quality. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow several cameras to capture the object so that a plurality of different views can be generated.

27. Claim 17 is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 8. Please see the discussion of claim 8 above.

28. Claim 20 is considered a computer program claim corresponding to claim 8. Please see the discussion of claim 8 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

29. Claims 4 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

30. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding ***claims 4 and 13***, the primary reason for indication of allowable subject matter is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest determining if the selected camera is being used by another user and selecting another camera if it is determined that the camera is being used by another user.

Art Unit: 2612

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (For either formal or informal communications intended for entry. For informal or draft communications, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Villecco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service desk whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



JMV
2/16/04



WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600